



John Pisula
189 E. Siket Street
Harmon, Guam 96929

Teresita Untalan
NAVFAC

Subject: N40192-15-D-9010 T.O. 0003, Demolition Services; 112 Units (Phase II)
Capehart Housing, Andersen AFB

September 1, 2017

Please find attached price breakdown and other supporting documents for our claim on this contract, for an increase in the contract due to constructive changes amounting to a total of (b) (4)

The request for equitable adjustment is submitted by Wolf Creek Federal Services (WCFS) due to the unforeseen conditions encountered which resulted to increased cost not realized in the original proposal.

The constructive changes include:

1. Reinforced concrete slab in excess of 6": Cost Impact - (b) (4)
 - a. The unusually thick concrete floor slab were encountered in 86 units that accounted for approximately 2,057 CY of reinforced concrete. The demolition additional volume resulted to increased labor, equipment and disposal costs.
2. Reinforced concrete foundation removal: Cost Impact - (b) (4) (Reference: Attachment #3&4)
 - a. Large foundation were encountered then removed in each of the slabs on 26 units which was exposed as the work progressed. This foundation was connected into the existing floor slab.
3. Reinforced concrete foundation beam approximately 36" deep (Reference Exhibit 3): Cost Impact - (b) (4) (Reference: Attachment#2)
 - a. Large foundation beams approximately 5'x1' were encountered in each of the slabs on 94 units which was inadvertently exposed as the work progressed per the direction from response on RFI#4. Additional work was required to separate the double layers of concrete slab from the large foundation beams/footings at the perimeter and internal load bearing walls of the structure.
4. Equipment Stand-by Costs: Cost Impact - (b) (4) (11/2017-12/2017)



- a. NAVFAC allowed us to mobilize to perform work which include heavy equipment and personnel. We were then unable to utilize the equipment due to the pending resolution to the chlordane issue. The uncertainty on execution of the demolition, resulted to equipment stand-by costs.
- 5. Unforeseen waterline: Cost Impact - (b) (4) (Reference: Attachment#1)
 - a. During demolition, we've experience water line breaks which were not identified nor terminated when the utility company turned-off the waterline indicated in our Utility outage requests. AAFB utility shop was unable to identify the gate valves of these abandoned waterlines. We had to perform capping of these waterlines as it affected our work and safety of our personnel.

As these aspects represent differing site conditions than that which was originally proposed WCFSI respectfully requests for a claim.

Should you have any questions you may contact myself or a member of my team for further clarification. Your consideration in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Best,

John Pisula
Project Manager